



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,676	06/05/2001	Steven M. Johnson	HRA/12428	7977
27505	7590	12/28/2005	EXAMINER	
RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP 4080 ERIE STREET WILLOUGHBY, OH 44094-7836			REKSTAD, ERICK J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/874,676	JOHNSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Erick Rekstad	2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6,7,10-12,15-18,22-25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 15, 17, 18, 22-25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is a Final Action for application no. 09/874,676 in response to the amendment filed on October 24, 2005 where in claims 6, 7, 10-12, 15-18, 22-25 and 27-30.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 24, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regards to the applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claim 25, the applicant states that Passman and Jones do not teach the feature "wherein said server further classifies said video information in public information accessible to all of said plurality of display sources and private information accessible to only a selected number of said plurality of display sources." As shown in Figure 9, it is clearly shown that the devices and users are divided into groups. Since the video information is provided by a device or user only to a device or user within the same group it would have been obvious that the devices and users are classified as public (Group T3 in Figure 9) or private (Groups T1 and T2 in Figure 9). It is suggested by the examiner that the claims be amended to further embody the disclosed invention in order to overcome the Prior Art. For example, including the limitations already indicated as allowable.

In regards to the applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 27 and 29, the applicant argues the motivation to combine the references. The applicant further argues the combination would not teach cameras in a vehicle directed to areas outside the vehicle. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to

combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Passman teaches a camera system for a bus where in there is an interior camera for viewing inside the bus. Schmidt teaches not only the viewing inside the bus but the additional use of cameras to view the outside of the bus (Col 10 Lines 28-35). The outside view is used for the additional features of preventing vehicles from passing a boarding bus and providing views of blind spots. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the interior viewing system of Passman with the viewing system of Schmidt in order to provide the ability to not only view the interior of the vehicle but also the exterior as taught by Schmidt. The examiner views the exterior viewing cameras of Schmidt to be "disposed in one of said vehicles" as the cameras are placed within housings (Fig. 6) which are a part of the vehicle (30 and 70, Fig. 3). It is suggest by the examiner that the claim be amended in order to specifically claim the applicant's invention.

In regards to the applicant's arguments regarding the rejection of claims 15, 17, 18, 22, 23, and 24 the applicant argues there is not suggestion to combine. The examiner would like to note that claims 15, 17 and 18 are dependent upon a cancelled claim. Further, it is assumed that the claims are suppose to be claimed to independent

claim 12 which is in condition for allowance. The applicant argues that " the examiner posits that multiple cameras could be used, for example to monitor the driver as well as students on the bus." This argument is irrelevant to the claims as claims 22, 23 and 24 do not require such a feature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15, 17, and 18 recites the limitation "The method" in claim 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 14 was cancelled by the applicant in the amendment filed on October 24, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22, 23, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,636,256 to Passman et al. in view of US Patent Application Publication US 2001/0032335 to Jones, US Patent 5,917,405 to Joao and further in view of US Patent 6,675,386 to Hendricks.

[claims 22, 23 and 24]

As shown in Figure 1, Passman teaches a communications system, comprising a plurality of vehicles; a plurality of web cameras, each of said cameras being disposed in

one of said vehicles and being active when the vehicle is running (note: each vehicle(102) contains a camera (101)). Passman further teaches the means for transmitting information from said vehicles via a wireless network, said transmitted information including video information from said web cameras. Passman further teaches a server (108, Fig. 1) for receiving the video information and providing a plurality of images for viewing by a plurality of communication system users (122) (Col 3 Lines 9-25 and Col 4 Lines 30-35). Passman does not specifically teach the use of an identifier for each of said web cams. Jones teaches a similar network based camera system as depicted in Figure 7. Jones further teaches providing each camera a specific identifier (Pages 10-11 Paragraphs [0130]-[0132], Page 15 Paragraphs [0215]-[0219]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Passman with the identifier of Jones in order to access the camera over a network as taught by Jones.

As shown in Figure 6, Jones further teaches the selection of a remote camera (steps 60 and 61) (Page 5 Paragraph [0059], Page 8 Paragraph [0091]). Jones does not specifically teach the entering of user-selected parameters. Hendricks discloses a web based network of video cameras that are disposed in remote areas See figure 8B. The user is capable of searching for predetermined parameters such as cameras in a particular location. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to search for any pertinent information to view the activity in a particular location fitting the parameters.

[claim 30]

Jones further teaches the cameras are forward facing in relation to the housings for the cameras (Col 3 Line 60-Col 4 Line 43, Col 5 Lines 33-39, Figs 2, 4, 5, and 6).

Note the camera in Figure 5 is positioned in order to be facing forward as it is facing the same direction as the front mirror surface (46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have forward facing cameras in order to obtain images of passengers and blind-spots as taught by Jones.

Claims 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,636,256 to Passman et al. in view of US Patent Application Publication US 2001/0032335 to Jones.

[claims 25 and 28]

As shown in Figure 1, Passman teaches a communications system, comprising a plurality of vehicles; a plurality of web cameras, each of said cameras being disposed in one of said vehicles and being active when the vehicle is running (note: each vehicle(102) contains a camera (101)). Passman further teaches the means for transmitting information from said vehicles via a wireless network, said transmitted information including video information from said web cameras. Passman further teaches a server (108, Fig. 1) for receiving the video information and providing a plurality of images for viewing by a plurality of communication system users (122) (Col 3 Lines 9-25 and Col 4 Lines 30-35). Passman does not specifically teach the use of an identifier for each of said web cams. Jones teaches a similar network based camera system as depicted in Figure 7. Jones further teaches providing each camera a specific identifier (Pages 10-11 Paragraphs [0130]-[0132], Page 15 Paragraphs [0215]-[0219]).

As shown in Figure 9, Jones teaches the classifying of the video as public or private by putting the devices and users into groups (Page 7 Paragraphs [0075]-[0081]). Jones further requires the use of a password in order to allow the user to have access as required by claim 28 (Page 5 Paragraph [0065]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Passman with the identifier of Jones in order to access the camera over a network as taught by Jones.

Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,636,256 to Passman et al. in view of US Patent Application Publication US 2001/0032335 to Jones and further in view of US Patent 5,793,420 to Schmidt.

[claims 27 and 29]

As shown in Figure 1, Passman teaches a communications system, comprising a plurality of vehicles; a plurality of web cameras, each of said cameras being disposed in one of said vehicles and being active when the vehicle is running (note: each vehicle(102) contains a camera (101)). Passman further teaches the means for transmitting information from said vehicles via a wireless network, said transmitted information including video information from said web cameras. Passman further teaches a server (108, Fig. 1) for receiving the video information and providing a plurality of images for viewing by a plurality of communication system users (122) (Col 3 Lines 9-25 and Col 4 Lines 30-35). Passman does not specifically teach the use of an identifier for each of said web cams. Jones teaches a similar network based camera

system as depicted in Figure 7. Jones further teaches providing each camera a specific identifier (Pages 10-11 Paragraphs [0130]-[0132], Page 15 Paragraphs [0215]-[0219]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Passman with the identifier of Jones in order to access the camera over a network as taught by Jones.

Passman teaches the use of the system in order to prevent violence between students on school buses (Col 1 Lines 29-36 and Col 6 Lines 16-25). Passman does not teach the use of cameras directed towards areas outside said vehicle. Schmidt teaches the use of a plurality of cameras positioned in order to observe the outside of a school bus to prevent vehicles from passing a boarding bus and provided views of blind spots in addition to an interior viewing camera (Col 1 Lines 32-67, Col 4 Line 65-Col 5 Line 15, Col 10 Lines 28-35, Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Passman and Jones with the cameras of Schmidt in order to provide viewing of unlawful acts and blind spots as taught by Schmidt.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, and 16 allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erick Rekstad whose telephone number is 571-272-7338. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on 571-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Erick Rekstad
Examiner
AU 2613
(571) 272-7338
erick.rekstad@uspto.gov

ERICK REKSTAD
GIMS PHILIPPE
PRIMARY EXAMINER